

Claim 34 (amended). The program product of claim 25 wherein said component download selection list contains the size of each said plurality of page components.

24
Claim 35 (amended). The program product of claim 25 wherein said component download selection list includes a status item, said status item dynamically displaying the amount of each of said plurality of page components that has been downloaded.

Remarks

In the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 13-19, 24,25,27-32, 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over Logan et al. (Patent No. 5,802,299, hereinafter "Logan"). The Examiner stated that Logan discloses an apparatus comprising, at least one processor, a memory coupled to the at least one processor, a computer program residing in memory, the computer program commencing to download a file referencing a plurality of components, said computer program dynamically prompting a user to select which of said plurality of components to download. The Examiner cited column 4, line 14 of Logan that describes a kiosk 10 including a hypertext browsing and control program that allows programs, control data files and displayable hypertext data to be periodically updated from time to time by transferring information from the authoring computer to the kiosk computer.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are patentably distinct over the cited references. In particular, the applicants note that amended claim 1 recites a computer program "dynamically prompting a user to select which of a plurality of components to download when downloading a file referencing the plurality of components." As described in applicants' specification, the claimed invention allows users to conserve bandwidth by allowing them to selectively download components that are referenced by the

file. Such ability is particularly applicable to web browsers used to access the Internet, where many web pages include large components such as Java applets, graphics and multimedia. Applicants submit that none of the cited art dynamically prompts a USER to select which of a PLURALITY OF PAGE COMPONENTS are to be downloaded when downloading a file that references the plurality of page components. Instead, the cited portions of Logan merely describe how Internet technologies can be used to provide an interactive computer display kiosk. The cited portion seems to deal with how a developer can update the kiosk from a web server. Nowhere does it describe how a user can selectively download components that are part of a page, as claimed by the applicants. This is further illustrated by FIG. 2 of Logan that illustrates how a user references a page using a URL request and how an HTML page is returned to the web browser 107. Nowhere does applicant find where the user of web browser 107 is dynamically prompted to select which components in the HTML page to download.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1 is patentably distinct over the cited Logan reference. Likewise, amended independent claims 13 and 24 include similar limitations. Furthermore, as claims 2-12, 14-23, and 25-35 depend from and include all the limitations of their corresponding independent claim, they are also submitted to be patentably distinct over the cited art.

Furthermore, with regard to claim 4, the Examiner stated that Logan discloses a component download selection mechanism as claimed, citing column 6, lines 18-25. The Examiner noted that the resulting touchscreen signal is processed by the executing web browser program which responds by issuing a request for the retrieval of displayable data identified by a particular URL. The Examiner then noted that the request is processed by an access control mechanism indicated generally at which includes a mechanism for comparing the URL in request with URLs in a transition list. Again, applicants submit that Logan does

not dynamically prompt a user to select which of a plurality of page components to download, and thus does not dynamically create a component download selection list as claimed in claim 4.

With regard to claim 5, the Examiner stated that Logan discloses a computer program that comprises a web browser and wherein said component download selection list is formed in a second pane of said web browser and displayed with said file, as claimed, citing column 10, line 63. The Examiner said that this section said that the Link Handling dialog box contains a "Target" area (such as a first pane) for entry of information specifying the handling of the linking function, and a "Transition Display" area (such as a second pane) for entry of information specifying the manner in which insertion pages are to be displayed prior to the requested information. Again, applicants submit that Logan does not dynamically prompt a user to select which of a plurality of page components to download, and thus does not prompt them in a second pane of the web browser. The portion of Logan cited by the Examiner describes how a developer can use the Logan invention to selectively make pages available to the kiosk user. See column 10, lines 47-52. It does not allow a USER to selectively download COMPONENTS of a page, as claimed by the applicants.

With regard to claim 6, the Examiner stated that Logan discloses the claimed feature of the download selection list being formed in a dialog box. In particular, the Examiner stated that Logan discloses the one screen appearance of a dialog box employed to interactively obtain control information which defines or redefines links appearing in displaced hypertext documents in column 3, line 3. With regard to claim 7, the Examiner stated that Logan discloses the claimed feature of the component download list being inserted into said file and displayed to the user with said file. In particular, the Examiner stated that Logan discloses HTML documents take the form of conventional ASCII text files which included imbedded tags which format the text for display presentation and provide links to graphics

files containing images which may be imbedded in the documents, as well as links to other web pages to which hypertext jumps may be made. With regard to claim 8, the Examiner stated that Logan discloses the claimed download selection list containing the file name for each of the plurality of components. In particular, the Examiner stated that Logan says that linked files and documents are identified within the imbedded tags in a predetermined URL format. With respect to these rejections, the applicants again submit that none of the cited portions are part of a component download selection mechanism, as claimed by applicants, and that the cited portions merely recited common usages of HTML elements.

In the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-12, 20-23, 26, and 33-35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Logan in view of Karev et al. (Patent No. 5,802,518, hereinafter "Karev"). The Examiner restated the rejections given with regard to Logan, but admitted that Logan did not disclose a component download selection list that contains the type of each of said plurality of components, as recited in claim 9, or the size of each of the plurality of components, as recited by claim 10, or a status item, as recited by claim 11, or a percentage of component downloaded, as recited by claim 12. The Examiner then stated that these items were disclosed by Karev.

Again, applicants submit that not only does Logan NOT disclose a download selection list with the elements cited in claims 9-12, it does not disclose ANY download selection list as claimed by the applicants. Furthermore, those elements in Karev referenced to disclose the claimed feature are not listings of "page components" as claimed by the applicants. In fact, the only thing in Karev that appears at all similar to the claimed download selection list is that illustrated in FIG. 2, but that appears to be just a listing of different documents, not a dynamically created download selection list. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 9-12, and the similar claims 20-23, 26, and 33 are also patentably distinct.

Furthermore, with regard to claims 36 and 37, applicants submit that neither Logan nor Karev disclose the claimed features of a web browser application including a component download selection mechanism as claimed, or a method for downloading an HTML document that includes the claimed steps. In particular, nowhere are the steps of parsing HTML document for references to said plurality of embedded components and prompting a user to select which of said plurality of embedded components to download by displaying a component download selection list on said web browser, as claimed by the applicants.

In summary, none of the references cited by the Examiner nor any other known prior art, either alone or in combination, disclose the unique combination of features disclosed in applicant's claims presently on file. For this reason, allowance of all of applicant's claims is respectfully solicited.

Applicants hereby declare that any amendments herein that are not specifically made for the purpose of patentability are made for other purposes, such as clarification, and that no such changes shall be construed as limiting the scope of the claims or the application of the application of the Doctrine of Equivalents.



Docket No. RO996-141

It is requested that a one-month extension of time be granted for the filing of this response, and a check for the appropriate extension filing fee is enclosed herewith. If any additional fees are due as a result of this response, please charge IBM Corporation Deposit Account 09-0456. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By S. Jared Pitts
S. Jared Pitts
Reg. No. 38,579

16 Feb 1999

SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS
20 West First Street
Mesa, AZ 85201
(602) 655-0073